

3 NOV 09 1999

MR. BENEZETTE: My name is Louis Benezette from

4 Pioche. I was gratified but a little confused to hear many of
5 the things I was about to try to say said by Ginger Swartz and
6 Bob Halstead.

7 I would like to say that I strongly support
8 the -- the issues that they've raised.

1 I feel that the proposed action does not
10 represent a solution to the problem of nuclear waste in
11 America.

12 In order to find a solution to that problem, real
13 alternatives need to be addressed. This may not be entirely
14 the fault of the DOE, but of the political process, but in
15 order for a solution to be found, it is necessary to look at
16 all of the alternatives, including reprocessing, transmutation,
17 so forth.

18 Also, I feel it is the fault of this process that
19 basic uncertainties remain as to the nature of the problem, the
20 quantity of waste to be disposed of, for example.

21 Also the question of whether or not a second
22 repository would eventually be needed as originally proposed.

2 Yucca Mountain site is not suitable as a
24 repository, both because of what we know about it and what we
25 don't know about it.

ATLAS REPORTING SERVICES
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
(888) 4-ATLAS-1

~~30~~

①

3

1 [What we do know involves the magnitude
2 earthquakes that have occurred in the region, the fact that
3 it's a seismically highly active region; uncertainties about
4 groundwater movement, but evidence that water has moved within
5 a recent time frame through the rocks surrounding the
6 repository.]

4

7 [The fact that the design of the repository is a
8 design which is based on eventual exposure of the environment
9 to radio -- radiation, both to the eventual failure of the
10 casks in which the radiation will be buried and the eventual
11 failure of the geologic formation to contain the material.

12 The uncertainties regarding how the
13 transportation of this stuff to Yucca Mountain would be
14 accomplished also raise major concerns.]

1
(cont'd.)

15 [What we don't know about it, the Environmental
16 Impact Statement, one large area of inadequacy in the document
17 that I feel is the number of areas where conclusions have not
18 been reached where the document simply states that additional
19 studies would need to be done.]

5

20 [The failure of the document to identify the
21 mitigations that would be implemented to deal with the problems
22 of nuclear waste accidents, either at the facility at Yucca
23 Mountain or in the course of transportation], and [of course the
24 major uncertainties involved in designing and operating a
25 facility such as Yucca Mountain over a 10,000 year time frame

4
(cont'd.)

1 and uncertainties as to the climates in the region over that
2 long period of time, the human conditions, human societal
3 conditions that would be obtained in the region over that
4 period of time and what kind of future pathways people -- would
5 cause people to be exposed to radiation.

1
(cont'd.)

6 [In fact, Environmental Impact Statement does not
7 even adequately describe the Yucca Mountain proposal or how the
8 site would be managed over the closure.]

9 Specifically I'm concerned about a number of
10 issues that affect Lincoln County and of course these center
11 primarily around transportation issues.

6

12 [A major concern is the possibility of an
13 intermodal facility for transfer of nuclear waste being located
14 right here in Caliente with heavy-haul routes.

15 The EIS is clear is supposed to be a document
16 which could be used as the basis for a decision on what the
17 transportation modes would be and what the transportation
18 routes would be. It is totally inadequate to serve that
19 purpose.

20 There is not adequate information in the EIS
21 about the effective environment or about the risks that would
22 be posed to the specific populations along the various
23 transportation routes in the event of normal exposure during
24 normal operations or accidents.

25 The whole section on transportation is deficient

1 in my view by failure to show the impacts of nuclear waste
2 accident on the environment in specific areas.]

3 MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds, please.

6
(cont'd.)

4 MR. BENEZETTE: [There is no serious risk
5 assessment of the intermodal facility in Caliente and what
6 effect it would have on the population in the area or in the
7 town.]

7

8 [There is an absence of any discussion of
9 detrimental, socioeconomic impacts from the proposal such as
10 the effects on businesses, effects on tourism or migration of
11 people, effects related to perceived risk and stigmatization.]

5
(cont'd.)

12 [There is again an inadequate coverage of the lack
13 of capability to face emergency response requirements in rural
14 communities in places like Caliente, and again a failure to
15 specify and commit to the mitigations that would be necessary
16 to adequately protect our communities in the event of an
17 accident.]

18 I'll try to come back and complete my comments
19 later.

20 MR. LAWSON: I appreciate it. Thank you very
21 much for your comment.

22 The next speaker is Marshall Dunham, to be
23 followed by Hal Keaton and Bud Charleston.